

some similarities between them. Nevertheless, there are sufficient differences in wording limiting structure and function to be patentable under the meaning of Rule 75(b).

Probably the most similar two claims are Claims 4 and 28. However, even here the preambles, which define the scope, are different. Claim 4 claims a display unit and Claim 28 claims a display monitor, which very similar but not identical. In a careful comparison of these two claims, only one element is strictly in common (flat panel display), two elements (c) and (d) are similar but not identical. The other elements sufficiently different, i.e., the wedge base limitation in Claim 4, and attachment to base at front in Claim 4 vs. the rear in Claim 28.

The other claims have much greater differences between each, as shown in the attached Table 1, having a underline emphasizing the specific differences in each claim-to-claim comparison. The dependent claims mention in the OA contain even more limitations distinguishing them from their independent claims. The dependents contain greater differences than their recited parent claims. For all the above reasons, applicant believes there is no basis for the obviousness-type double patent rejection. Applicant respectfully asks for the claims of this application be allowed,

Claims 24-26 and 28 Sec 103 Rejected
over Hillary IVO Conway

Examiner rejected Claims 24 -26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillary in view of Conway. Applicant admits Hillary teaches a stand with various support arms and hinges. However, as the examiner admits that Hillary fails to teach a flat panel display. Examiner states that Conway teaches a display device stand. However, applicant disagrees, Conway does not teach a display stand, instead they teach a folding portable notebook computer, which can be arranged in several ways. Conway's split keyboard may support their flat panel display in an unstable manner. Conway support mode cannot be considered as a "display stand".

Webster's New World Dictionary [The World Publishing Company, New York, 1998] defines the verb "stand" as: to stand, be placed, as also in stable. state. station, etc.; and, the noun "stand" to be: "a standing; especially a stopping; halt or stop." Look at Conway's split keyboard support in Figs. 1, 2 and 3; Conway's support lacks the required function of a stand, i.e. physically stable. Conway's support it lacks both physical halt or resistance to physical forces, such as to normal finger and hand forces.

In addition, Conway does not teach nor anticipate support arms that are critical to applicants claims. The Webster's New World Dictionary defines a "arm" to be: "n. 1. an upper limb of the human body. 2. anything immediately resembling this; especially, a) a branch of a tree; b) a branch of a river." In studying the Conway reference closely, they do not teach any part that can be considered an "arm".

Also, Hillary fails to teach: 1) flat panel display, 2) front base hinge, or 3) mid point base hinge. Where in Conway or Hillary do they teach what modifications are required to make applicant's claims? Examiners must carefully consider ALL the words (limitations) in the applicant's claims and carefully compare them to the prior art, when determining obviousness or non- obviousness.

As to Claim 24, applicant claims a display device stand without a display device of any type. Both Conway and Hillary fail to teach a stand without a display.

As to Claim 25 and 26, they are both dependent claims of 24, and add limitations to further distinguish them from Conway and Hillary.

As to Claim 28, applicant teaches a flat panel display monitor, with a unique support structure and function which is not specifically taught in Conway, Hillary or other know prior art.

Claim 29 Rejected Under Sec. 103(a)
Hillary IVO Conway and Park

Applicant agrees that Conway and Park teach a display device comprising battery power. However, Conway, Park and Hillary fail to teach nor anticipate the function of removing their display from other apparatus. There is no teaching in the above references on what modifications to make or why one should make them. Applicant's disclosure does teach removing the display device. Thus Claim 29 is non-obvious under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a).

Claim 31 Rejected Under Sec. 103(a)
Hillary IVO Conway and Yaniv

Examiner states that the reference of Yaniv teaches a "display monitor having a telescoping post means (23) mounted on a base unit." Applicant cannot find such a reference in Yaniv. Element (23) of Yaniv is a "telephone handset" (see Col 8 line 29). Applicant does not understand the facts of the examiner's rejection of Claim 31. Applicant believes the examiner probably mistook the word "telephone" in Yaniv for the word "telescoping" in the applicant's claim. A telescoping post as in the applicant's disclosure and claim is a mechanical post arrangement, made from a plurality of hollow rod sections of differing diameters such that each post section can be slid into the larger diameter section -- like a telescope. Applicant most respectfully asks the Claim 31 be allowed.

Claim 27 Rejected Under Sec.103(a)
Nagaoka In View of Hillary

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's statement that Nagaoka teaches a base unit. Nagaoka teaches a portable computer unit with flat panel attached to a computer housing. The computer housing is comprised of a keyboard, computer system, and hinge for the display near the middle of the housing. There is no teachings in Nagaoka that anticipates vertical elevation adjustment, or display monitor structure of function. Nagaoka teach away from vertical

adjustment by teach overall function of portability. The parts referenced in the OA for Hillary are not strictly correct. In Hillary part 12 is a "boom", part 46 is 'boom/platform axis", and part 100 is a "CRT display". There is no teaching in Hillary for flat panel display or pivot means near middle of the base. Hillary teach away from flat panel display by teach complex heavy duty apparatus for position adjusting a heavy CRT display. For the above reasons, applicant requests the Claim 27 be entered into allowance.

Claim 30 Rejected Under Sec 103(a)
Nagaoka IVO Hillary and Yaniv

Nagaoka, Hillary, and Yaniv do not anywhere in their references disclose, teach nor anticipate a telescoping post, of any type or any equivalent. Applicant believes the reference of Yaniv was entered by the examiner mis-interpreting element names. Applicant most respectfully asks the Claim 30 be entered into allowance.

Request For Notice Of Allowance

Claims 24 - 31 particularly point out the inventions of the applicant, and the claims are novel, and non-obvious under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103. **No new matter has been added.** Thus a Notice of Allowance is most respectfully solicited.

Attached is Table 1 (page 7 of 7)

Sincerely,



Richard J. Ditzik
Applicant Pro Se

307 Surrey Drive
Bonita, CA 91902
(619) 661-2252

Date: 6 July 1998



TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF CLAIMS* FOR DOUBLE PATENTING

Note: Some of the differences are highlighted via underlining.		
* Summary of claims presented here; not all words in the claims are shown in this table.		
Indep. Claims of '570 Patent (Ditzik)	Indep. Claims of this Application	Differences between Each Claim
1. A desktop computer system comprising:	24. A display device stand for holding a flat panel display assembly for resting on top of a roughly flat horizontal surface, comprising:	Claims 24 and 1: Claim 24 claims a <u>display stand</u> with a support arm means, support pivot means and a base unit. Claim 1 claims a <u>computer system</u> with a first support arm pair, a second support arm pair, computer means, and <u>housing means</u> with connection at <u>front</u> .
a. a flat display panel assembly defining a display screen and support structure;	a. means for flat panel display assembly pivot and clamping functions;	
b. a <u>first support arm pair</u> physically connected to the display panel assembly via the first hinge pair,	b. a support arm means attached to the hinge and clamping means for supporting and positioning the flat panel display assembly;	Claims 4 and 24: Claim 4 claims desktop <u>display</u> with a support <u>hinge pair</u> , support arm means, a pivot means, and <u>wedge base</u> with connection at front. Claim 24 claims a <u>display stand</u> with a support are means, support pivot means and a base unit.
c. a <u>second support arm pair</u> connected to the other ends of the first support arm pair via a second hinge pair;	c. a support pivot means attached to the support arm means, working in cooperation for plurality of position adjustments;	
d. means for <u>digital data computing</u> ;	d. a base unit attached to the support pivot means, wherein the base unit provides sufficient mechanical stability.	Claims 13 and 24: Claim 13 claims a <u>display unit</u> with <u>telescoping post</u> , wedge base, and <u>one support hinge pair</u> . Claim 24 claims a <u>display stand</u> with a support arm means, support pivot means and a base unit.
e. means for housing main electronics having a third hinge pair located near the front corners of the unit; and		
g. the said main housing means being sufficiently large to enclose the computing means.		
4. A desktop display unit for viewing by the user, which is to be placed onto to the top of a desk or table structure, comprising:	27. A display monitor adapted to rest the monitor on a horizontal surface comprising:	Claims 27 and 4: Claim 27 claims display monitor with base unit, base support pivot means, support arm adjustment means <u>at middle of base</u> , panel support pivot and flat panel display. Claim 4 claims desktop display
a. a flat panel display assembly defining a display screen and control electronics;	a. a base unit adapted for resting onto on a roughly horizontal surface or a desk or table;	with a support <u>hinge pair</u> , support arm means, a pivot means, and <u>wedge base</u> with connection <u>at front</u> .
b. a support hinge pair connected to the bottom edge of the flat panel display assembly;	b. a base support pivot means attached to the base unit near <u>the middle</u> of the base unit;	Claims 27 and 1: Claim 27 claims <u>display monitor</u> with base unit, base support pivot means <u>at middle of base</u> , support arm adjustment means, panel support pivot and flat panel display. Claim 1 claims a <u>computer system</u>
c. means for support arm position adjustment connected the flat panel display;	c. support arm position adjustment means connected to the base support pivot means for position adjustments;	with a <u>first support arm pair</u> , a second support arm pair, computer means, and housing means with connection <u>at front</u> .
d. means for pivot connector attached to the bottom portion of the support arm position adjustment means, and	d. a panel support pivot means attached to support arm position adjustment means, and	Claims 27 and 13: Claim 27 claims display monitor with base unit, base support pivot means <u>at middle of base</u> , support arm adjustment means, panel support
e. a roughly <u>wedge shape</u> base unit connected to pivot connector means near the <u>front end</u> of the wedge shape base unit.	e. a flat panel display assembly connected to the panel support pivot means near the bottom edge of the flat panel display assembly.	pivot and flat panel display. Claim 13 claims a display unit with <u>telescoping post</u> , <u>wedge base</u> , and <u>one support hinge pair</u> .
13. A desktop display unit for computer use by a user, which is to be placed onto to the top of a desk or table structure, comprising:	28. A display monitor on a roughly horizontal surface of a desk or table, comprising:	Claims 13 and 28: Claim 13 claims <u>telescoping post</u> , wedge base, and <u>one support hinge pair</u> . Claim 28 claims <u>two</u> support pivot means and a base unit with connection to pivot means <u>at rear</u> .
a. a flat panel display assembly defining a display screen and control electronics;	a. a flat panel display assembly defining a display screen and control electronics;	Claims 4 and 28: Claim 4 claims a support <u>hinge pair</u> , support arm means, a pivot means, and <u>wedge base</u> with connection <u>at front</u> . Claim 28 claims a <u>first support pivot</u> , a support arm adjustment means, a <u>second support pivot</u>
b. a support hinge pair connected to the bottom edge of the flat panel display assembly;	b. a first support pivot means connected to the bottom edge of the flat panel display assembly;	means and a base unit with connection to pivot means <u>at rear</u> .
c. means for telescoping post support connected to the bottom of the support hinge;	c. support arm position adjustment means connected the flat panel display assembly for elevation and inclination position adjustments;	Claims 1 and 28: Claim 1 claims a <u>computer system</u> with a <u>first support arm pair</u> , a <u>second support arm pair</u> , computer means, and housing means with connection <u>at front</u> .
d. a roughly <u>wedge shape</u> base unit attached to telescoping support post means near the <u>front end</u> of the wedge shape base unit, and	d. a second support pivot means attached to support arm position adjustment means . . . ; and	Claim 28 claims a <u>display monitor</u> with two support pivot means and a base unit with connection to pivot means <u>at rear</u> .
e. said support hinge and the <u>telescoping post</u> means working together.	e. a base unit adapted for resting onto horizontal surfaces, wherein the base unit is connected to the second support pivot means near the <u>rear of the base unit</u> , . . .	

7077